

REMARKS

By this Amendment, the claims are amended to merely clarify the recited subject matter and overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and correct various noted informalities, Figure 1 is amended to be properly labeled as prior art and the Abstract is corrected to be in full conformance with all requirements. Claims 1-20 are pending.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-20 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt et al. (U.S. 6, 070, 192; hereafter "Holt") in view of Lager et al. (U.S. 6, 636, 502; hereafter "Lager"). Applicant traverses the rejection because the cited prior art, analyzed individually or in combination, fail to disclose, each or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims.

For example, the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention related to a general packet radio service system that utilizes response messages to a request to create a PDP context.

Holt merely teaches that a network controller collecting loading information receives a message requesting an address to a gateway node. In response to the request, the network controller sends the network access server information indicating which gateway to send the connection request. That identification of the gateway is determined by the network controller; however, the network controller does not act as a gateway.

Thus, Holt fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the claimed invention wherein a gateway detects whether or not a condition is fulfilled. Furthermore, Holt fails to disclose, teach or suggest a gateway that sends instructions to select another gateway node by indicating the other gateway node.

In fact, Holt actually teaches away from the claimed invention wherein the condition fulfilment detection is decentralized to gateway nodes. Rather, Holt actually teaches centralized network controller collecting information on gateway nodes and making decisions.

Lager fails to remedy these deficiencies. Thus, the combined teachings of Holt and Lager would merely provide a solution in which a GPRS system would contain a new centralized network node, wherein the network controller would be configured according to the teachings of Holt. In such a system, the PDP context activation would include two additional signalling messages: the SGSN asking from the network controller an address of a GGSN and the network controller sending the address of the selected GGSN.

However, any subsequent PDP context activation would continue in accordance with the teachings of Lager; thus, the GGSN would not send any instructions containing an indication of another gateway node. Furthermore, the GGSN could not detect whether or not a condition defined for the GGSN has been fulfilled.

Thus, Holt, or a combination of Holt with Lager, fails to teach or suggest a gateway support node that sends instructions to select another gateway support node, or any claim feature related to that selection.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-20 is traversed and claims 1-20 are allowable.

Therefore, Applicant looks forward to receipt of a notice of allowance indicating the allowability of the pending claims. However, if anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin L. Kinney #51875

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
CHRISTINE H. MCCARTHY
Reg. No. 41844
Tel. No. 703 770.7743
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: June 8, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900

PUUSKARI -- 09/869,247
Attorney Docket: 060258-0281450

IN THE DRAWING(S):

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet showing Figures 1 and 6.